

Plan of Contents of the quantity field and the analysis of the expression plan within the frame of the field theory

Aliyeva Gulchohra

Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, Azerbaijan

ABSTRACT

Development level of modern science of linguistics is characterized by increasing interest to the description of descriptive function of the language. That's why the attention of the investigators, having changed its orientation, has directed to the study of mutual correlations of elements of different language levels, taking part in conveying the contents of the utterance. This allows making the analysis possible not only directed from forms to contents, from means to functions, but also it makes it possible to carry out analysis directed from contents to the forms/from functions to the means. To study quantity semantics expressed by the word form, having the meaning of grammatical quantity, we think it purposeful to divide them into two groups – to the morphological and syntactic forms. Morphological quantity forms are peculiar to the substantivized words and nouns possessing correlative quantity forms. These forms reflect logical dependence on the real quantity of the intended object. But syntactic quantity forms are peculiar to the words of parts of speech, the word forms of which depend on the nouns grammatically and which reflect their quantity.

KEYWORDS: quantity, context, semantics, field theory, quantity field of the objects, quantity field of the movements, plan of the contents, expression plan

Contents plan of the quantity field and the analysis of the expression plan, the unification of language means within the quantity macro-field bases on the extremely generalized meaning of the quantity. We can distinguish two types of nuclear of the objects in the field of quantity: grammatical category of quantity and number. The difference between their usages often bases on the definite and indefinite quantity meanings. The nuclear in the field of quantity of the movements manifest themselves in the form of word-forming affixes and lexical means. In the field of quantity of signs comparative degree as a grammatical category can be accepted as nuclear. By this time context plays an important role in the expression of this or that quantity meaning.

Introduction

Characteristic feature of modern linguistic science is an attempt, made by the scholars to study the complicated language systems, mainly, to study the completion of the ties, their varieties and understanding of the objects, being in mutual correlations with the surrounding atmosphere. From this view point the necessity of giving dynamism to the explanation of systematic approach to the existing fields becomes more obviously visible. Very rapid widening of theoretical knowledge and all the fields of experimental - practical investigations brought to the global change to the style of scientific thought and gave an impulse for the creation of paradigm of creative activity of the new scientific thinking.

Establishment of the methodology of creative activity in linguistics, first is linked with the rapid development functionalism which declared the instrumental conception of the language. As to this conception, language is a means of mutual social impact and human beings in their mental and practical activities mutually influence on one another by the force of language. In the conceptions and categories of functional linguistics, language structure, in the process of realization of speech, is studied in the concrete speech practice, and that's why, today, all the imaginations, which are explained by the factual usage of everything by grammar, which is called "natural grammar", is just linked with this functional direction.

Dynamism of the state of a language is mostly associated with the division of its system and with its separately-taken semisystems and peripheric fields. We think that it is purposeful to carry out functional-grammatical investigations from the position of the theory of language fields, in such directions, which modernize conceptual-language operations and which creates possibilities to analyze language and speech facts by the principle of "aim means", namely, to carry out these investigations giving possibilities to determine which means of a language possesses to attain communicative purpose and gives possibilities to determine in which attitudes these means are. Establishment of field grammar and its development in the modern theory of perception is inseparable from the thought of "creative activity" paradigm.

Field analysis as the manifesting methodic in more special forms of the functional direction is aimed at reflecting in more perfect form of the life activity of the language, and its deeper objective laws of its mutual ties with creative activity. In this case, in the realization of the principles of the field approach, often the problematics of systematization, from the traditional object – from the language (language structure) passes to the speech communication. At the same time as language and speech, reflect directly the reality of thought, and agreeing with the fact of transition of language and speech into each other dialectically, we may base on such a conclusion that, today the methodological duty of linguistics is to make attempts not to isolate language and speech, but it is to make attempts to understand in which mutual ties they are, and in which common platform these mutual ties are possible. Besides, it is important not only to accept the existence of such mutual ties, but also it is important to create its model.

The analysis of the wide positive experiment of such a field investigation in linguistics gives us possibilities to conclude that the field conceptions which the linguists

have worked out, have more advanced our imaginations of objective laws of the establishment and existence of language and its separately-taken fields and by this, it has made methodic as one of the leading orientations of modern linguistic science (Shchur G.S., 1974). Nevertheless, in the existing conceptions to the description of language means, their description in the national and individual human conscious of extra linguistic realities and so the ability of reflecting such notions in human speech are not paid sufficient attention. In these conceptions, approach to the language as the unity of system and function has not found its satisfactory reflection. Language and speech categories and structuralizing of semi systems and the realistic future development of field theory of modeling of the language, for example, as a taxonomic unit, for the transition of a language to the “field” as an instrument of learning in its concrete realization, the link in the general theory, which may appear to be as methodological basis has been investigated very little. Communicative pragmatic characteristics of the units entering the field too (especially archeological) has been apart from the investigation up to the present day, because in the widest literature linked with field problems, such a view point occupies the advantageous position and thinking as if field conceptions of the language are purely pragmatic conceptions, analysis in them has been closed by the system of language means.

It is more interesting that, until the latest period functional orientation in linguistics unexceptionally developed as a synchronic approach. Consequently, the theory of language field has been left completely unstudied in the diachronic plan, whereas new principal possibilities to be able to give more dynamism to the diachronic investigations, to be able to ensure the possibilities to bring the system of functional means with which it will enable the investigators to approach the problem as a historical event, and necessity for the search of methods are of no doubt.

Today, the problems which have been less investigated may be belonged to the issues linked with the application of Interlingua confrontations which are carried out on the functional background of field modeling, especially contentive typology which is actively developing.

The modern level of development of the science of linguistics are more characterized with the more increasing interest to functional grammar and in the widest sense, to the problems of functional description of the language. This is absolutely an appropriate, for today, linguistics has been directed in the consideration of the language nor as “language in itself” (Ferdinand de Saussure, 1977) not as the purpose of classification of the language as an aim, or as the systematic descriptive aims, it must be directed to understand the language as a real practical conscious, as an important means intended in the human society in the condition of communication. That’s why the attention of the investigators having changed their orientation must be directed to the mutual ties (correlations) of the elements belonging to the study of the objective laws of activities of language units and their descriptions, must be directed to the mutual ties of the elements, belonging to different levels and taking place in the revelation of meaning of the utterance. This assumes not only the possibility of analysis in the direction from forms to

meanings/from means to functions, but also it makes it possible to make analysis in the direction from meanings to forms/from functions to means. As such an approach pays necessary attention to semantics and as it creates possibilities to describe the language as an active means of the expression of the thought, it completely reflects dialectic principles.

Study of the category of quantity.

Category of quantity as the category of quality which is linked with it is a category of universal conception. While studying different varieties in different languages we mean the semantic functional unity of the elements in mutual ties of different language, levels, the existence of the known to us semantic invariants of these elements in differential semantic signs as proper “functional-semantic category” (Bondarko A.V., Bulanin L.L., 1967).

The theory of functional-semantic category is in the stage of all-rounded development based on materials of the languages possessing different systems, different structures. It is worth mentioning that this is one of the most complicated problems in grammar. Interest to the semantics of quantity is explained by the reflection of quantitative opportunities peculiar to objects of different types, to movements and features and to proper notions. We consider the notion of “quantity” not by movements and signs, but often we consider it as a wider notion of “quantity” than the one which is linked with things (objects) (Kholodovich A.A., 1979). But even when we deal with the quantity characteristics of the things (objects) we happen to indicate the sum of these things. For example, while speaking in the Russian language on the combinations as *два дома* in the Azerbaijani language “iki ev” in the English language “two houses”, if we say that the sum of the quantity of the things in these languages are expressed as special cases, we can say that in the words of *домик*, “evcik” “small house” (in the form of belittling), *домище* “böyük ev” “a larger house”(in the form of overstate), not the quantity of the things are expressed, but the things are determined as to the quantity of mass.

The expression of quantity is associated with the usage of means of different levels. Now the specification of this or that quantity meaning, the loss of one meaning and the context, expressed by another meaning is of great significance. Besides, some language units express the meaning of quantity, just in context, in the combination of other units (Baudouin de Courtenay I.A., 1963).

To study the quantity semantics expressed by the word forms of grammatical quantity (single, plural) we have thought it purposeful to divide them into two groups – morphological and syntactic forms. Forms of morphological quantity are peculiar to the substantivized words and nouns, possessing correlative quantity forms. These forms reflect logical dependence on the real quantity of the intended thing (object). But the forms of syntactic quantity are peculiar to the words of parts of speech, reflecting their quantities and word forms of which grammatically are depending upon nouns. In quantity such a dependence is peculiar for the words, having attributive meanings and manifest themselves in word combinations and sentence structures.

Syntactic forms of the expression of Quantity are peculiar to all the changing words, the quantity of which is opposite to the quantity of the noun (during the agreement) or to the words conditioned by the syntactic, semantic features of the words on which they depend (during the governing). The volume of the syntactic forms can be partially enriched by the principle of economy. In the Russian language the usage of syntactic forms of the “secondary parts of speech” is also possible – we appreciate quantity forms, depending upon the syntactic forms of the nominal predicate of the attributes like this: in the Russian language (“Onlar menim doğmalarımdır. Emma xala anamın bacısıdır”) (They are my natives. Aunt Emma is my mother’s sister).

In the context the main quantity semantics of the morphological forms of singular and plural shows itself in different diversions. This is helped by the semantics of the surrounding words, by the presence of words having certain forms indicating quantity in the sentence and by other context circumstances. In a certain condition a) substitution of each other without doing harm to the expressed semantics of the quantity forms, b) gaining additional semantic colorings in the context of quantity forms, c) neutralization of the quantity semantics of the morphological quantity forms (expression forms of the meaning of quantity by morphological means are intended) may take place.

Syntactic quantity forms expressing the quantity semantics in the non-redundant form functionally may be considered as equal to the morphological forms.

To the dependent forms belong the nouns of the quantity forms “not expressing meanings” only in singular (*singulalia tantum*) and only in plural (*pluralia tantum*) and also forms of predicative words in the one-member sentences of other types. In the last case dual classifications conditioned by the difference, being in the character of expression forms of the quantity are possible:

The first, quantity expressed formally, may not be adequate to the real contents. For example, in the indefinite personal sentences the verb form of the plurality may belong not only to the real plurality of subjects, but also may belong to a subject as well. Another example: in the common personal sentences the belonging of movement to the plurality of subjects (to the whole class) is possible to be expressed by the singular form of the predicative word, but by this time there appears discrepancy between the same form and its real quantity contents.

The second, formally expressed quantity may not belong to any semantic contents, but it may belong to the field of language technique. Such forms are possessed not only by syntactic correlation with the subject, but also they are possessed by predicative words in the one-member sentence, having no logical tie. Namely, there is not any basis for the expression of the number of subjects. This brings to putting not any condition related to the number of predicative words in these constructions.

As the component from the field of quantity of the grammatical quantity forms (either in the absolute form, or in the combinations by contextual means) first of all, during the adequacy of its semantic contents, there may be non-morphological correlative, distinguished by quantity semantics peculiar to the grammatical quantity category. After this we may show the forms, not having morphological correlative of the plurality

of the nouns possessing concrete contents of things. Consequently, it is necessary to remember the syntactic forms of attributive and predicative words used in nominal combinations of unchanging nouns.

3. Quantity semantics peculiar to the category of collective nouns.

As we are interested in the quantity semantics peculiar to the category of collective nouns we include into the list of words any nouns expressing the words in the singular form and by this time accompanied by the meaning of collection, inseparable meaning, which we are going to investigate. By this time we take into consideration the significant of plurality of the objects from the grammatical view point, whether they are countable or uncountable and possibility or impossibility of forming their grammatical forms of plurality. Such agreement of grammatical signs of words can be explained by the fact that we consider the collectiveness not as lexic-grammatic category, but as functional-semantic category (generally speaking, in relation to quantity as subcategory).

The semantic contents of the category of collectiveness are taken as equal to the total sum of these semes: “plurality” (definite or indefinite) + “sum total” + “Notions characteristic to things”. Such a combination is characteristic for the expression of this category by nouns. When this is expressed by other means, resubdivision of semes takes place. For example, the expression of noun combination with collective number of this category, the total sum and certain meaning of plurality is expressed by number but the meaning of the thingness is expressed by a noun. By the help of contextual means (together, all together) the meaning of total sum can be expressed, but the meaning of indefinite plurality and the meaning of thingness can be realized by the plural forms of the nouns. The nearest words to the collective nouns as to their semantic structures are the substantivized collective numbers in the semantic structures of which are all the three semes (Kholodovich A.A., 1979).

We may show the following types peculiar to the category of collectiveness, which can be made variation of accompanying semantic features: homogeneity of plurality or its heterogeneousness, dynamism (changability, reaching the limit), not reaching the limit, definiteness/indefiniteness, countable/uncountable.

The problem of mutual link of the meanings expressed by collective nouns with context is of great interest. For example, the meaning of collectiveness can be expressed only in the necessary condition of context (let's compare the usage of “non-collective” noun in the singular form expressing general plurality used as synecdoche with the material nouns, expressing indivisible plurality of the things (objects). In the context the plentiousness, expressed by the collective nouns is specified or the same meaning is strengthened, especially it is becoming more conspicuous: *двигался железнодорожный состав – двадцать вагонов с мазутом* “demiryol qatarı yola – içinde mazut olan iyirmi vaqon” (railway train started - twenty cisterns with black oil); ... видит перед собой все человечество – миллионы людей, покорно и с трепетом ловящих его слово “... qarşısında bütün beşeriyyeti – itaetkarlıqla ve heyecanla onun ağzından çıxan sözlerini gözleyen milyonlarla insanı görür” (...the whole mankind is

seen before him, millions of people waiting with excitement and obediently for the words uttered by his mouth).

We look upon the quantity semantics of “numeral + noun” combination, expressed in the sentence context from the view of coordination of quantity feature expressed with its conveyer of meaning. By this time it becomes clear that numerals usually state not only the number of monotonous things, when used with nouns, but also they express the meanings of the quantity of time and place section, including the quantity belonging to the movement as well (in the last case, in the special cases, we come across the word combination with “defe” (time). Though numeral together with numeral combination is absent in the sentence (with the exception of derivational numerals as to the structure) they can unite with words of different types, having the seme of quantity in their semantics, including the nouns, with motivized numerals as to the word-forming character, for example, in the Azerbaijani language as “iki onluq, üç yüzillik” (two tens, three hundreds).

Quantity in most of the realies, to which it is peculiar, mostly and in different forms manifests itself in movements. Being the element of the verbal lexeme, used in the context of quantity, peculiar to the real movements or being another lexic unit, finds its adequate expression in the language. The expression of the quantity within the limits of verbal lexeme is closely linked with the “movement styles” operating within the limits of grammatical category of manner, but our observations on the language materials makes it possible for us to say that, different quantity meanings, widely used within the limits of verbal word in the language, in definite movement manners, can't be expressed exactly and completely, though coordination among them is doubtless. On the basis of description the attitude to the movement process of quantity has been intended (Nasilov D.M., 1989).

It is studied in two types: a) quantity as an outer sign of the movement, and b) quantity as an inner sign of the movement. But it is necessary to note that such a division does not intend to specify the exact borders between the quantity meanings of the groups, because in some cases we observe dependence of them from each-other and dependence on mutual ties with each-other. Quantity as an outer sign of movement, manifests itself in its being one subjectivity/multisubjectivity, in one time or in many times. The meaning of one subjectivity – one objectivity of the movement in a number of languages is expressed by morphological forms of subject and object (in singular form) used beside the verb. Multisubjectivity of the verb may be definite and indefinite. The first of these meanings is expressed only in the analytic form – by the combination of numerals with nouns, besides, by the quantity adverbs as “ikilikde”, “üçlükde” (compare in Russian вдвоем, втроем) (in English in two, in three) (in the last case the meaning of multisubjectivity is accompanied by the meaning of “togetherness”, “wholeness”).

While putting different word forming elements such as “hamı, çoxları (compare in Russian все, многие, in English all, many of) beside the semantics of motivizing verbs, the indefinite plurality of the subjects, in the structure of verbs are expressed differently:

повставать “qalxmaq” to rise (all one by one), разъехаться “dağılmaq” (to scatter), съехаться “yığışmaq, toplaşmaq” (to gather, to assemble), передохнуть “qırılmaq, bir-bir ölmek” (to die one by one).

Prefixes, confixes express not only the indefinite multisubjectivity, but also they express other meanings characterized by quantity: the meaning of monodirectionality (слетаться “uçub gelmek” - to come flying), the meaning of different – directivity (разлетаться “uçub dağılışmaq” - to scatter flying), the meaning of discreteness (повставать “qalxmaq” - to rise (all one by one)).

The meaning of definite multiobjectivity is expressed in an analytic way, by the help of the signs of the objects, themselves, but the meaning of indefinite multiobjectivity possesses word forming markers: нахватать “toplamaq” (to collect), перебудить “hamını oyatmaq” (to wake up all), разбросать “sepelemek” (to scatter), понавещать “bir-bir baş çekmek” (to visit one by one).

Indefinite multisubjectivity meaning is expressed by the lexic meaning of the verb root as well: объединить “birleşdirmek” (to unite).

The meaning of multisubjectivity of the movement is associated with the meanings and gives the meanings of different directionness such as (in Russian разослать “gondermek”/bir neçe yere) in English to send to several places, different places (развешать “sermek”/paltarları) in English to hang up (dresses), the meaning of different time (in Russian переболеть болезнями “xestelikler keçirmek”) in English to catch diseases), the meaning of discreteness (перебудить “hamını oyatmaq”/bir-bir) in English to wake up everybody (one by one), etc.

The multisubjectivity and multiobjectivity combinations are the equivalents and more associated with the two subjectivity and at the same time two objectivity of the movement. In the Russian language the meaning of the equivalency of the movement is expressed by the word-forming means (переругиваться “söyüşmek” to curse each other) also by outer part of the verb lexeme друг друга “bir-birini” - each other by case forms of pronoun combinations. Besides this the meaning which is described is expressed by the unification of verb with noun as well: обмениваться взглядами (baxışmaq) to look at each-other.

By the help of different lexical means it expresses the meanings of doing the action at a definite and indefinite times such as (дважды “iki defe” - two times, неоднократно “defelerle” - repeatedly, many times), снова “yeniden, bir daha” (again, once more). By the prefixes перевоз-/вос - the repeatedness of the action is expressed: перестираять “yeniden, tekrar yumaq” - to rewash, воссоздать “yeniden yaratmaq, berpa etmek” - to recreate, to restore.

The repeated movement (action) may be linked with one object (переименовать “teze ad qoymaq, adını deyişmek, yeniden adlandırmaq - to rename) and also it may be linked with another object (переизбирать “yeniden seçmek, tekrar seçmek - to reelect). The repetition of the movement continuously includes its continuous reconsideration. This meaning is expressed by the words of adverbial modifier type such as всегда

“hemiše” - always, ежедневно “her gün, gündelik” - every day, каждый день “her gün” - each day.

Quantity as the inner sign of movement manifests itself in the measure of movement, in the character of its continuity. In this case different quantity meanings are associated with different qualities of the movement(Chesnokova L.

D., 1992; Menovshchikov G.A., 1970).

As to the meaning of indefinite measure of the movement the execution of the action can be considered in two plans – smaller size of the execution of the movement (action) and the larger size of the execution of the movement. The reflection of the smaller size of the action, depending upon the character of its movement, may be in different forms – in its strength (by this time in the semantics of the verbs there are the semes such as “astadan” (slowly), “sakitce” (silently), “zeif” (faintly), in its tempo, speed; in this case in its semantics it happens to be the semes such as: “yavaş”, “yavaş-yavaş” - little by little; in the quality of the action (in this semantics the seme is: pis - badly) in quantity-time restrictions (in semantics the semes are az-az, yavaş-yavaş, astaca, yüngülce, slowly) with which it manifests non-intensivity, weakness.

The analyzed meaning, for example, in the Russian language is expressed by word-forming means (пожадничать “bir az xesislik etmek” - to be a bit stingy), вздренуть “mürgülemek” - to doze, всплакнуть “ağlamsınmaq” - to seme weeping, приподнять “azca qaldırmaq” - to raise a little, подгнить “bir az çürümek” - to rot a little and also by additional lexical means – in verbal combinations немного “bir az” a little, слегка “yüngülce, azacıq” - slightly, чуть-чуть “bir az, azacıq” etc.

The weakening of the movement may show itself as the result of its addition too: подвзять “toxunub uzatmaq” - to stretch of touching, подкоптить “hisde ehmalca qurutmaq” - to dry with smoke.

The intensivity belonging to the plan of larger measure of the movement may show itself as the result of the executed larger size of the movement. By this time there in the semantic structure of the verbs there happens to be semes indicating the meanings as “güclü, möhkem, berk” (strong, firm, hard), “büütün, büsbütün, tam, her cür” (whole-some, whole, complete, all types of), переволновать “berk teşbişe salmaq” - to exite heavily, разукрасить “büsbütün bezemek” - to decorate all over, or it indicates the larger measure of movement (искусдать “dişlem-dişlem etmek” - to bite all over, заткать “naxışlamaq, yırtıqları ve ya sökülmüş yerleri toxumaq” - to adorn up, to knit the splintered, torn parts of the dress), also it indicates multisubjectivity and multisubjectivity etc.

The meaning of intensivity of the movement in the Russian language is expressed by word-forming means, by the prefixes пере-за, из-/ис, на, раз-/pac-, by means of confixes раз-/pac-ся, от-ся, вы-ыва, на-ыва etc.

The meaning of speediness and intensivity of the movement can be expressed by the repetition of the verbal word: Ждём, ждём, перенимаемся с ноги на ногу – Gözleyirik, gözleyirik, qızımızın birini götürüb o birini qoyuruq. Wait and wait, lift up one foot and put down the other. Besides this the expression of the meanings of

intensivity beyond the verbal lexeme is also known to us. We can show to this such examples used in verbal combinations as сильно “çox, son derece, berk” - very, extremely, hard, очень “çox, olduqca” - very, very much, как следует “laziminca, emelli başlı” as follows, as much (well) as etc.

In the Russian language the meaning of supply of the movement of the subject may be considered as the result of the intensivity of the movement as well: насидеться “çox oturmaq” - to sit too much, належаться “doyunca uzanmaq, çox uzanmaq” - to lie as much as one wants to.

The last stage of the measure of the executed movement is the extreme abundance of the measure of larger time for example; перележать “heddinden artıq, uzanmaq” - to lie extremely too much; засидеться “çox oturmaq” - to sit too much, it may also be the result of great power, intensivity which involves more objects than the norm, for example (перекалить “hedden artıq qızartmaq” - to redden too much, захвалить “hedden artıq teriflemek - to praise more than the norm, to praise too much; перегрузить “heddinden artıq yüklemek” - to load too much etc. The action which is executed on the object may result with the creation of different features as: убыстрить “süretlendirmek” - to speed up; уменьшить “azaltmaq” - to weaken, to lessen. This measure quantitatively may express the meanings of the events happening from time to time; for example: покрикивать “qışkırtmaq (arabir)” - to make somebody cry (sometimes), поглаживать “arabir tumarlamaq, arabir sığallamaq” - to pet on the head from time to time, sometimes).

The quantity of other aspects by the compound of verbs of movements, each of which is understood as one act of complex movements of non-homogeneity (very often consisting of two cases) which are splintered, into the chain of movements: переодеться “paltarını deyişmek” (soyunmaq ve geyinmek) - to change one's dresses, to take them off and redress; Извольте распорядиться, чтобы все это перебрали! “Buyurun gösteriş verin ki, bütün bunları seçib ayırsınlar”. Please command them, let them choose all these and put them aside.

Quantity as a sign of one feature, the first, it may be characteristic feature of a sign expressed by the language (Van Mintsi, 2004). For example, the expression of the signs associated with the largeness, massiveness of the object, its depth, its width, or the signs associated with time and place obligatorily is linked with the expression of the quantity: большой “büyük” - large, big; далекий “uzaq” – far, further etc. The second, one and the same quantity shows the features very often in the object in different forms and different sizes. Qualitatively, the expression of the degree of intensivity of this or that homogenous signs is linked with the expression by the language: сладкий “şirin” - sweet, сладковатый “şirinteher” - sweetish, сладчайший “çox şirin, en şirin” – the sweetest, сладкий-сладкий “çox-çox şirin” - very-very sweet, пересладкий “hedden artıq şirin” - extremely sweet etc.

We distinguish the analyzed semantics of the quantity based on double character of the sign linked with quantity. We look upon this semantics as the sign of the quantity and the quantity of the sign. The sign of the quantity is expressed by the lexic meaning

of the main body of the adjective and synthetically, in the names of the nouns themselves, in the word-forming structures of the nouns. Analysis gives us possibilities to group all the different meanings from the viewpoint of largeness or smallness of the size of the quantity. The quantitative meaning of the sign, namely, the meanings of different measures of their manifestations being the zero sign, gives the meaning of its weakening, intensivity, the meaning of extreme abundance. Such meanings are expressed by two forms:

1) by word-forming means:

-by prefixes: неизвестный “meşhur olmayan” - not famous, развесёлый “çox şen” - very joyful;

-by suffixes: слабоватый “zeifteher” - weak some, мясистый “etli, kök” - fleshy, fat (suffixes are more widely used than the prefixes);

2) by lexical means – by the lexic meanings of adverbs of quantity and the root of the adjective together with combinations used with it.

In the second case “quantity” and “sign” semes may be the elements of one word (большой “büyük” - large, горячий “qaynar” - boiling) or of different words (очень весёлый “çox şen” - very joyful, чересчур слабый “son derece zeif” - very weak, extremely weak). There is no exact border between the sign of the quantity and the quantity of the sign, because in both cases quantity as to the result is the characteristics of the bearer of this sign. This is affirmed by the unification of the same two meanings belonging to the same bearer within the context, by the redivision of these meanings: рученька “elciyez” - small hand, низенький “bir qeder alçaq” - a little lower.

4. Contents plan of the field of quantity and the analysis of the expression plan.

Contents plan of the field of quantity and the analysis of the expression plan (Khrakovskiy V.S., 1989), the unification of language means within the quantity macro-field, extremely bases on the generalized meanings, that's why in the above-mentioned macro-fields we think it purposeful to distinguish three semi-fields of the quantity: the semi-field of the things (objects), the semi-field of the quantity of the movement and the semifield of the quantity of the signs. For such a differentiation the objective basis are certain different planness of special semantics included into the general notion of “quantity”, its non-homogeneity, including some quantity signs which are peculiar to some types of realis, which in its turn causes certain differential semantic signs. But the quantity semifields is characterized by the greater commonness which is the basis for the unification of semantic signs within one macrofield; besides this certain commonness of the formal components of the mentioned semifields are also observed.

The analysis of the plan of contents of the quantity semifield gives us possibility to distinguish microfields, being common for the structures of all the three semifields for such a commonness, the basis is that they possess invariant quantity meanings. They include smaller and larger-sized quantity micro-fields, and exact and approximate quantity microfields. Besides this a number of semantic signs are the properties of just the two semifields. This discriminates them from the third semifield and gives us possibilities to distinguish certain microfields in these two semifields.

For example, we may distinguish the quantity fields of the things (objects) and distributive and non-distributive quantity fields of the movements, and the microfield of singularity and plurality and at the same time the last pair represent themselves in the quantity fields by their types – by mono subjected, mono objected micro fields and on the other hand, they are represented by multisubject and metaobject microfields. The analysis of the semantic structures of quantity macrofield indicates that there are common features between quantity fields of the movements and quantity fields of the signs (different from the quantity fields of the things (objects) for them are weakened and intensity micro fields are peculiar).

The possibility of distinguishing specific micro fields in the structures of semi fields bases on the differential semantic features. This is affirmed by the truthfulness of the division of quantity micro fields into separately-taken quantity fields. Such micro fields include divided and undivided quantity micro fields in the quantity field of the things (objects), discrete and non-discrete micro fields in the quantity field of the movements.

Many semantic features which are peculiar for each of the quantity fields exist mutually associated with one another and side by side with one another. Such some mutual ties among them brings to crossing of the micro fields, and creation of the micro fields with the same limit, with the same border. For example, these are the same borders of micro fields among the quantity micro fields of smaller and larger sizes, of minimal and maximal limits, dividing and undivining micro fields, they are the micro fields with the same borders between the singularity and plurality micro fields.

The list of all the micro fields divided in each of the structure of the three semi fields (either divided into parts, or minimal, namely the micro fields of the smallest sizes) shows that the poorest field in the semantic structure plan is the field of quantity of the signs. In the plan of contact in other semi fields the quantity field of the movement can be considered the quickest semi field. It includes into its composition, on one side, the micro fields which are peculiar for the quantity field of the things (objects), but on the other hand, it includes micro fields of other types - micro fields which are common for the quantity field of the signs. The indicated features of the field quantity give us possibility to determine its middling position in the structures of the quantity micro fields – the middling position between the quantity field of the things (objects) and quantity field of the signs.

During the analysis of expression plan of quantity macro fields, from the view of semantics, in the considered micro fields two types of the usage of language means are observed: either one of them is characterized by the fact that it is marked or the other being not marked, or both micro fields are marked. The commonness of the semantics of the quantity semi fields very often leads them to the commonness of the formal means – to the commonness of their structural components. In the quantity of formal components of different micro fields difference is observed.

The issue of language level of formal means to which the components of semi fields belong and associated with it, the nuclear of the semi fields and issue of their pe-

ipheral, the commonness in the character of formal elements of semi fields are observed, during the confrontation of the quantity field of the things (objects) with the quantity field of the movements. They include grammatic (morphological), lexicagrammatic, word-forming and lexica-syntactic means.

In the quantity field of signs there are means of grammar level – grammatic forms of the comparative degree of adjectives. The most universal field entering the composition of quantity field and the composition of all the micro fields are the means of lexical level. The special weight of word forming (affixal) means is too great.

It is difficult to isolate in the quantity micro field, because certain objective laws related to the specialization of the components manifest themselves only in separately – taken semi fields. We can distinguish two nuclear in the field of quantity of the things (objects): grammatical category of quantity and numeral. The difference in their usage often lies on the fact, whether the things possess indefinite or definite quantities.

In the field of quantity of the movement's nuclear manifests as word forming affixes, lexical means. In the field of the quantity of the signs, the grammatical category of comparative degree can be accepted as a nuclear.

Category of quantity in the system of language is subordinated to the categories of thingness, movement and sign. In different languages it shows the same collection of semantic signs manifesting itself as the confrontation of mutual ties with one another or as hierarchy. They give us possibility to distinguish the connection of the category of quantity with the category of thingness, movement and with the category of sign, and on the other hand they help us to discover the common activity of the numerated by us categories.

Conclusion.

Having generalized all the above-mentioned theses we may conclude that:

1. The expression plan of the quantity category in the investigated language is characterized by multi-functional collection of means of different levels.
2. The difference in the expression plan of the category of quantity shows itself in the mutual attitude of the types of means belonging to this category and in the semantic signs which they express, in the systematization of means of different types and in the specify of some means peculiar to a concrete language.
3. The plan of contents of functional-semantic category of quantity is identical in different languages, but the plan of expression depending upon the general structural type of the language is more associated with the exceptional synthetic and exceptional analytic which exist in its type.

References

- Baudouin de Courtenay I.A. 1963, Quantification in linguistic thinking. Selected works on general linguistics: Volume 2, Moscow, p.311-324
Bondarko A.V., Bulanin L.L. 1967, -Russian verb. Leningrad, p.18

- Chesnokova L.D. 1997, Category of quantity and ways of its expression in the modern Russian language // Taganrog, 1997, p.56
- Ferdinand de S. 1977, Course of general linguistics. Works on linguistics. Moscow, p.146 |
- Kholodovich A.A. 1979, Problems of grammatical theory. Leningrad, p.109
- Khrakovskiy V.S. 1989, Typology of iterative constructions. Leningrad, p.5-53
- Menovshchikov G.A. 1970, Ways of expression of singularity and multiplicity in the languages of different types // Problems of linguistics. №1, p.82-88.
- Nasilov D.M. - Problems of Turkic aspectology: Aktionsart. Leningrad. Nauka, 1989, 208 p.
- Shchur G.S. 1974, Field theory in linguistics. – Moscow, Nauka. p. 225.
- Van Mintsi. 2004, The expression of quantity in the Russian language (From the position of the carrier of the Chinese language): dissertation thesis, Penza, p.174.